SUPERFUND PROGRAM PROPOSED PLAN

METAL BANK SUPERFUND SITE
Philadelphia, PA

ORIGINAL
(IN BLUE & TEAL)

- - -

Thursday, July 27, 1995

- - -

Public meeting held at the Disston Recreation Center, 1511 Disston Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on the above-mentioned date, commencing at 7:30 p.m., before Diane C. DiMidio, Registered Merit Reporter.

- - -

KARASCH & ASSOCIATES, INC.
Registered Professional Reporters
The Waldron Building
301 West Market Street
West Chester, PA 19382
(610) 696-8010

MEMBERS OF THE PANEL:

CESAR LEE
BRUCE RUNDELL
AMY BARNETT
ROY SMITH
PATRICK ANDERSON
U.S. EPA - Region III
841 Chestnut Building
Philadelphia, PA 19107
(215) 597-3037

- - -

MS. BARNETT: Good evening, everyone. My name is Amy Barnett and I'm with the Environmental Protection Agency.

I'm here tonight to talk about the Metal Bank Superfund Site, which is on the banks of the Delaware River, not too far from here.

Specifically, we're going to be talking about the proposed cleanup alternatives for the Metal Bank Superfund Site. If anybody is here for some other reason, then I just wanted to make that clear from the start.

In addition to myself tonight, we have other members of the Environmental Protection Agency who are going to be talking about the Metal Bank site. They are Cesar Lee, who is the Remedial Project Manager. He is going to be making the majority of the presentation; Bruce Rundell, who's with our -- he is our groundwater specialist. And we also have Roy Smith, who is a toxicologist with the EPA and he will be talking about health-related issues. And we also have members of our National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in attendance in the audience as well.

If anybody wants more information once you hear what we have to tell you tonight, we

have quite a bit of information at the Northeast Philadelphia Library on Cottman Avenue. You can go there and get more information about the site.

Yes?

MS. McELHONE (A Member of the Audience): There's nothing there.

MS. BARNETT: There's nothing there? We'll check into that.

Okay. Don't go to the Northeast Philadelphia Library on Cottman Avenue looking for information. We'll have to look into that.

Our agenda tonight is that following my introduction, César Lee is going to spend some time talking about the history of the site. He's going to talk about some of the options that we have for cleanup, and then we're going to have a short presentation by Bruce Rundell about some of the groundwater issues and a short presentation by Dr. Smith about some of the health-related issues.

If you have questions as we go along, we'd appreciate it if you hold them until the end because some of your questions may be answered as we go along. However, if you feel like you're going to forget or you feel like something that comes later might be compromised if you don't have the answer to

your question, then do raise your hand and we will call on you during the presentation.

You notice here to my left we have a stenographer who is taking down everything that everyone says tonight because we have not made a decision about what cleanup option we would like to use, although we have identified a preferred alternative, one that we think is going to work the best. However, we do need comments on all of the alternatives and what you all think is best, and in order to do that we need somebody who can write all this stuff down and give it to us in a written form so we can then address it.

All of the comments that we get tonight or that we receive through the mail during the comment period, which is in effect right now, we will address in something that is attached to the decision that we make, which is called a Response and Summary.

Because we have a stenographer, when you ask your questions after we conclude our presentation, please state your name. And if your name is difficult, please spell it for her.

Do we have any questions before we start? Yes?

MS. McELHONE: My name is Virginia

McElhone, M C E L H O N E.

Would you please tell me what notification system was used to tell people about this meeting.

MS. BARNETT: Okay. We put advertisements in one of the local newspapers and we also put an advertisement in the Philadelphia Inquirer. There was one advertisement that occurred two weeks ago and one that occurred yesterday. And in addition we also mailed out some of the proposed cleanup alternative plans, which are in the back of the room, and there should have been one at the library. I apologize for that not being there and I'll have to follow up on that.

MS. McELHONE: So the only advertisement was a notification in the newspaper which would have been anywhere within the newspaper?

MS. BARNETT: Yes. It may have been anywhere in the paper.

We did also a couple of months ago drive around and tried to get names and addresses of industries or residents who may live near the actual site. But I have to tell you we didn't really come into this neighborhood because there would have been so many people and our mailing list would have been

hundreds or even up to thousands of people.

MS. McELHONE: All you need is one loud voice. So I think you finally reached the right people.

MS. BARNETT: Okay. Without further ado, Cesar Lee.

MR. LEE: A lot of these overheads that I will be showing you are in your Proposed Plan and I'll mention if they aren't.

First is where the site is located at. We're over here and the site is located towards the river. And if you were driving on I-95, you would have seen the building, which is part of the site over here. There's a courtyard, which we'll be referring to in part of the remedy behind the building or for the building, and over here is the Delaware River.

MS. BARNETT: Can everybody hear Cesar? Okay.

MR. LEE: This next picture, just to get everybody familiar with the site, is the names of different areas of the site which we'll be referring to in the remedy.

The first is -- a couple things first. The building area is here, which you see in this slide here. Located adjacent to it is St.

Vincent's School, which is over here. Once again the building is here.

Across over here is the marina, a yacht club, Quaker City Yacht Club, located right about here. When there's high tide, this is what you see, and you're looking at the site standing from over here. This will be part of the Delaware River.

Also surrounding the site if you were standing over here looking towards your east will be industrial areas. This is a scrap metal yard. And once again if you're standing over here, you would see the Delaware River again.

There's -- these are monitoring wells, which we've installed on site. We'll get to that a little later.

This is what we call the riprap area right over here that borders the site right along here. You can see from this picture there are boats along there, stationed along there, recreation boats. What's interesting about this is when it's low tide here, you can see an oil sheen seeping in the Delaware River. There's also people who fish around here from boats or from land. Once again we're standing along here at the riprap area.

Over here we're standing right

around about over here when the tide gets low. You could actually walk on it and from this picture this individual uncovers the top layer and they can see a little oil underneath there, and in this oil we found PCBs in pretty elevated concentrations. So there is a relation between the tide from the Delaware River and this mudflat area.

This is a well that I noted a little before, which is located right about here, and you notice when we took a water sample from this well, you see the oil dripping from that groundwater sample. Once again there were some pretty high levels of PCBs noted in there, and that's in that photograph that's attached to the Proposed Plan, the actual levels of the PCBs.

This picture is taken about around here, which we call the southern portion of the site. When we excavated this area we found a lot of debris. Some of the debris included copper, wires and plastic bags and so forth.

This next transparency, I just want to go down the line of what the site issues are. Between 1950 to 1967 the site -- the southern portion of the site was basically part of the Delaware River until it got filled up to its present elevation.

Between 1968 to 1973 this facility was used as a place for recycling transformers, taking the oil out and recovering whatever salvageable parts that are concerned with transformers.

About 1972 the Coast Guard came out to investigate reports about spills in the Delaware River around that area, which was traced back to the site.

About 1977 the EPA took the lead on this site because of the concerns about PCBs.

I should just mention that PCBs is of concern to the EPA because it's known to cause cancer. It's not biodegradable but it's biocumulative and biomagnified, which means that once you -- one of the lower species or organisms ingest it it and other species ingest it after that, it just adds up until it finally gets into people who ingest whatever animals there are in the -- lower in the food chain.

In 1980 the EPA and the site owner, Metal Bank, was in court attempting to resolve the cleanup remedy.

In 1983 that was settled when Metal Bank agreed to install a groundwater recovery unit to recover the oil. About the same time the site was placed on the NPL. That's the National Priority List

on which all the superfund sites are ranked.

In 1989 the recovery system was dismantled. This is described in more details in the Proposed Plan of what actually happened.

In 1991 PRPs, which stands for Potentially Responsible Parties, in this case it consists of a lot of the utility companies, signed on to do a study which the EPA calls the RI/FS, which stands for Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study.

About 1995, earlier this year, the PRPs submitted the RI/FS to the EPA, and we are at this time today basing the results of that study to try to select a remedy.

With that I'd like to just turn the presentation to Bruce Rundell, one of our hydrogeologists, who will be talking about the groundwaters and so forth.

MR. RUNDELL: The site is underlain by about five different types of material, the most important being up the top where we have man-made fill, and that fill ranges in thickness from about five feet on the landward side and it increases in thickness to about 30 feet at the edge of the river.

It shows you on that slide, it has

all kinds of stuff in it. There's basically anything that was handy when they filled it in. There was cement and there's wood and there's all kinds of stuff out there.

Below that are the river sediments that vary from about 10 feet to 30 feet. They thicken as you get closer to the middle of the Delaware River.

And below that, these river sediments are what you see in the mudflats. That's where they're exposed at low tides.

Below the river sediments is the Trenton gravel. It's a regional aquifer. It's about 40 to 80 feet thick. It's used over in New Jersey as the drinking water supply.

And below that is bedrock, which is the Wissahickon shifts, which as you drive around the neighborhood you see a lot of homes built out of this really nice looking gray and silver white material. That's the Wissahickon shifts.

Most of what we're concerned about is what's going on in the man-made fill. The type of activities that were conducted at the site was recycling of the PCB oils in transformers where the PCB is, and there were numerous spills out there over

time and that oil seeped into the ground and floats pretty much on top of the water table. During the earlier action they pumped out like it was estimated about 14,000 gallons over a number of years, and basically they pumped out through wells on site as much oil as they could physically pump out. And now what we've been doing is going out and investigating the site to decide how much contamination is still left and what to do about it.

This -- these river sediments, which are composed of sands and silts and a little bit of clay or gravel right on top, pretty much confines this lower aquifer from the site. Most of the groundwater in the site flows directly into the river.

Groundwater investigation focused basically on installing a number of monitoring wells, which are these points here. There's 15 of them in all that we put throughout the site in that fill area, and from that we would take water samples to see what kind of contaminants might be dissolved in the water or what kind of products or oil might be floating on the water table. We measured that.

We also measured the depth from the surface of the ground down to the water table. And

what that gives us is the ability to make this contour map which is the top of the water table. This is like looking at a contour map of topography where high numbers like ten are up on the hill, and as you go down you get down to four feet.

These numbers are feet above mean sea level. So it's just like looking at a topographic map where this is a high here of ten feet. And you basically get down here where eventually you come out right at the river level.

And what that tells us is, just like on ground, everything rolls down hill. Groundwater flows down hill and it will flow from the direction of high elevation to low elevation and basically the groundwater flows across the site in this direction, which are these arrows.

During the investigation we found an area that still had a little bit of oil on it, which is what you can see in the picture that Cesar showed. It's very thin, less than an inch thick. It's a tenth of an inch thick where you could measure it.

But the problem is that that thin film of oil that's on top of the water table still migrates to the river. You can see that in the seeps,

in the areas where the groundwater would come out at the river's edge at low tides.

So that's pretty much our main problem as far as groundwater is concerned is the transport of that thin film of oil on top of the water table as it migrates to the river.

Now, I'd like to turn it over to Roy Smith to talk about the human health risks.

DR. SMITH: Thanks very much.

I assume that anyone that would come out to an unairconditioned hall for a meeting like this on a night like this must really want some information.

I brought along a ten-minute talk about how the EPA conducts a risk assessment. I'll talk about that for most of the ten minutes and the last couple minutes I'll show you the human health risk estimates for this site and give you an idea of what they mean and how we propose to act on them.

What I'll talk about first is the risk, as we estimate it, is a combination of human exposure to a chemical and the toxicity of that chemical. We'll talk about the toxicity of non-carcinogens, that is chemicals which have some kind of systemic effect but which are not believed to

cause cancer, how we evaluate the toxicity of chemicals that do cause cancer, how we estimate human exposure to these chemicals, and how we combine the toxicity to estimate the health risk, and I'll try to emphasize all the way through that these estimates are not best estimates. It's important that you understand this.

When somebody talks, for example, about the chance of dying in a traffic accident, that's estimated at about one in 65. That's a best estimate. It's maybe plus or minus ten percent for most people. That's the best estimate we can give you.

When we do this kind of risk assessment, what we're giving you is an upper bound estimate. There's so much uncertainty around the best estimate that we have decided -- the EPA has decided as a public policy to give the benefit of that uncertainty to the exposed public. So that our estimates are all upper bound. We make the decisions on the basis of something which is very much like a worst case risk estimate.

The first principle is that risk is a combination of dose, which we've calculated a thing called exposure assessment, and the toxicity of the

chemical, which we calculated a thing called dose response assessment. The exposure assessment is specific to each individual site. It's done tailor made for that site. The dose response assessment pertains to the chemical. So if it's arsenic, for example, we treat arsenic the same way at each site that it occurs.

The principle here is important. If either exposure or the toxicity of the chemical is lacking, then there is no risk. You must have both things, dose and toxicity, for the risk to exist.

Here's the process that we do with dose response for a non-carcinogen, a chemical we do not believe causes cancer. It's pretty obvious. First we get all the papers we can from the literature. We select the relevant papers of high quality. We read them all and chose the ones with high quality and we use those.

We go through them and we find the smallest dose that caused some kind of bad effect in any species, anything that we consider adverse.

Then we take that smallest dose and divide it by an uncertainty factor -- these uncertainty factors range from a hundred sometimes as high as three thousand -- to get a thing called a

reference dose. A reference dose is the dose which we are willing to say is safe. The EPA thinks that this dose is a safe dose and we set it between a hundred and three thousand times lower than any dose that causes an adverse effect in any species that we can find out about. So this is a level that is way below anything that has ever been found to cause a toxic effect in any study.

The EPA thinks that the reference dose is safe for human populations, including sensitive individuals. We're willing to say this dose is safe. It may be possible that some higher dose is also safe, but we're not sure.

For carcinogens, we do some of the same things. We go to the literature, we get the peer review papers, and then we pick the good papers, and then we pick the species that gets the most tumors per dose, the most sensitive species to the carcinogenic effect.

Then we find the upper bound level of tumors per dose. We don't use best estimate. We take a statistical upper bound. If this is the best estimate, then the upper bound is even higher.

Anyway, we take the upper bound of that estimate. The next thing we do is we then assume

that there is no threshold for cancer, that any dose whatsoever, no matter how low, has a very small chance of causing cancer and that if you double the dose, you double the chance, but that the only dose that will cause no cancer is zero. Anything above zero has a slight probability of causing cancer.

This may not be true. Some carcinogens may actually have a threshold. Little dose, little dose, little dose, no cancer, and then the cancer starts at some finite dose. But we assume that that is not so. We use a thing called a linearized multi-stage model.

Then we convert this carcinogenic potency study to a human potency study -- up to now we were dealing with animals -- by a metabolic rate method. I won't go into this, but it is the most conservative method. FDA, for example, uses the body weight method, which is, depending on what organism we use for your test, can be anywhere between five and a hundred times less protective than the EPA's method.

So the carcinogenic potency slope represents the reasonable upper bound cancer risk. Again, the important principle here is it's not a best estimate. It is an upper bound. The true risk is probably less and for some chemicals it may be zero.

On the other side, the exposure assessment, we look at each site and we decide what kind of people might be exposed to the contamination on the site. Typically we'll deal with future residents, current residents, industrial workers, construction workers, recreation users, trespassers, all sorts of people that might come on the site and contact the chemical.

For this particular site it was pretty obvious that future residential use is unlikely. So we left out future residents and we assessed industrial workers, construction workers and recreational users.

Typical exposure routes that EPA uses: Drinking water, ambient air, soil and dust, homegrown produce, fish and game, any way we think people might contact these pollutants.

In this case, it's very unlikely that anyone will be drilling a well on the site and drinking the water. So we left that out. We assessed ambient air, soil and dust. Again, there's no homegrown produce because we don't expect residential use. But we did assess fish and game consumption.

Each exposure assessment is tailored to the site so that no two of them are

alike. We selected the exposure routes at this site based on the actual characteristics of the site.

Then we assume people are exposed in certain ways. We give two kinds of estimates, a central tendency estimate and a reasonable maximum estimate.

So here, for example, we have assumed that -- well, if we had done residents, we would assume nine years of exposure for central and 30 for maximum, 350 days per year. If we had done tap water, it would have been one liter per day, two liters per day.

The pertinent things here are adult soil ingestion. We assume that every adult that contacts contaminants on the site ingests a hundred milligrams a day. This is equivalent to sticking your hands in potting soil and then licking them clean every day. It's a very stringent assumption. 25 milligrams a day is perhaps more like the truth, but we've assumed a hundred.

Construction worker we've assumed a hundred for the central tendency and 480 milligrams a day for the upper bound, the reasonable maximum estimate. That's sticking your hands in potting soil and licking them clean five times a day.

We assume that adults weigh 70 kilograms -- that's about 155 pounds -- and inhale either 20 cubic meters of air a day or 30 as the reasonable maximum.

Essentially what we did at this site was to take samples of fish tissue, soil, we chipped pieces of concrete from the insides of the buildings, we took groundwater samples out in the flat area, a lot of soil samples where we thought there was PCB contamination, and all these things went into the risk assessment as the contaminant levels that people could contact.

The characterized risk then, to combine the dose and the toxicity. For non-carcinogens we got what we call a hazard quotient. This is simply a ratio between the dose, which is milligrams of contaminant per kilogram of body weight per day, and a reference dose. It's simply the dose we estimate the person could receive, divided by the safe dose. If this number is greater than one, the EPA considers it to be not acceptable.

Does everybody understand that? It's basically if the estimated dose exceeds the safe dose, the EPA considers this to be unacceptable. The safe dose is set very low.

For carcinogens we multiply that same dose -- that should be an X there -- it's times the carcinogenic potency slope. So it's dose times cancer risk per dose. A very simple calculation.

This risk number comes out as probability. It's just like odds in betting. The cancer risk of one in a million, for example, is just like one in a million odds against an exposed person getting cancer. That means if a million people have this exposure, that we assume no more than one of them would be likely to contract cancer. No more than one.

The EPA considers any risk above one in ten thousand to be unacceptable. So ten thousand exposed people, an upper bound risk of one cancer is unacceptable to the EPA.

Summarizing what I've said, risk is a combination of toxicity and exposure. The dose response part is specific to the chemicals we have and it's the same for all sites. The exposure assessments are specific to the individual sites, tailored to those sites.

These reasonable maximum exposures are deliberate overestimates. This is a matter of

science policy the EPA has developed in order to protect the exposed public.

The central tendency risk means -- are combinations of a best exposure estimate and still an upper bound risk so there's still-- I'm sorry, an upper bound dose, dose response, so that they're still very protective. In all cases, the true risk is probably less and may be zero. It's important to remember those things.

Here's the kind of risks we live with. Risk for a smoker, lung cancer, is about one in 11. Death in a traffic accident over your whole life is one in 65. Chance of getting cancer from drinking chlorinated tap water is about one in ten thousand, which is EPA's upper limit. Chances of getting cancer from eating a couple of peanut butter sandwiches a day are about one in one hundred thousand.

And this is my personal favorite. The chance of being killed by having an airplane fall on you is four in one million in a lifetime. Nobody worries about this except that it does happen. You remember a few years ago when Senator Heinz died. His plane landed on I think it was four school children. So this does happen. It's a real risk, but it's a remote possibility and no one stays up at night

worrying about it.

Here are the risks that are calculated at the Metal Bank site. There were three groups of receptors here, adult resident, child resident and adult employee. Adult employee in this case includes both workers who just work on the site but don't excavate, and also construction workers who do excavate.

There are a number of NAs here. These happened because the chemicals that we detected did not have reference doses. EPA has reference doses for over five hundred substances, but in fact there was nothing of importance from the non-carcinogenic point of view for these NAs.

For recreational use of the river, the adult resident had a hazard index of about three one-thousandths and the child had a hazard index of about one percent. This means that the non-cancer doses were far, far lower than anything that would be of concern. Remember, this has to be one before the EPA starts to worry about it.

However, cancer risk is three times ten to the minus four here. That means three in ten thousand. So that is somewhat above EPA's level for action, and the child had a risk of two in ten

thousand. These two can be combined for a combined risk of five in one thousand for someone who grows up eating fish on the river. This is entirely due to PCBs in the fish tissue. There's no other contaminant that contributed to this number at all.

Over here with the adult employee, skin contact with groundwater had a very small hazard index. Incidental ingestion and normal contact with surface soil, again, very small. Subsurface soil was more contaminated but still was not a significant -- a non-cancer hazard, and even the oil layer floating on top of the groundwater did not present -- a non-cancer hazard.

From the point of view of cancer risk, all of these numbers here are below one in ten thousand. This is six in one million, that is seven in one hundred thousand, that is one in one hundred thousand.

And this one here is six in one thousand. That's another high one. This is the risk caused by the dermal contact of a construction worker with the oily layer on top of the groundwater. This oily layer has a very high concentration of PCBs. And the construction worker that contacted this stuff, got it on ten percent of his skin for just one hour in his

entire life, we estimate would have a risk of something like six in one thousand. So clearly this is contaminated stuff and dermal contact with it is very dangerous.

These three things then -- actually these two things, PCB in the fish tissue here and PCBs in the oily layer floating on the groundwater at the site, are the only things we found in all these samples that could conceivably present an unacceptable human health risk. They need to be addressed in some way. All of the rest of the samples did not show any particular hazard to human health.

Okay? If you have questions about it, why don't you save them for later, and I'll turn it back over to Cesar.

MR. LEE: That slide that Roy just showed is not in the Proposed Plan, but what we came out with in the Proposed Plan, we used his number and crunched it in order to better define different areas like the riprap area, what the final risks are.

This next transparency is in the Proposed Plan. Just so you don't get scared of it, it's really pretty much detailed and it's more for the scientific people who want to review the proposed plans. The areas that we put in circles, for example,

over here are the highest observed PCB levels. Just a quick overall view. If you wanted to get more into details, these are in parts per million, which we've identified in here. This is, for example, the surface soil in the courtyard area, which if you wanted to really get into detail, you could cross reference up on this chart where they are at.

Other areas are like the chip samples we took in the building. The mudflat area, that's the area where the tide is, when it subsides what we found, the highest elevation in there. And soil boring, that's subsurface soil areas.

Once again, I don't want to confuse you. I think you want to see where it relates overall in the scope of the picture. So if you need to review that more in detail or have any questions, you can ask me later.

In addition to Roy doing the human health risk assessment, there were other specialists from the U.S. Fish and Wild Life Services who did assessment, how it relates to animals, and specialists from NOAA, who did assessments of how it relates to fish and aquatic species. The best way we could crunch everybody's risk assessment together is in a format in the Proposed Plan. I think that was in

Table One. And we identified the different problem areas.

What I've done was took those tables inside the Proposed Plan and crunched it with Table Two, which identifies the alternatives, and just laid it out for you what our proposed alternatives are.

Once again we're going over different areas. The building area, which includes the site boundary, that's everything encircling the site, the courtyard area, the river sediment areas, which includes the mudflat and the riprap and the Delaware River sediment areas, and the southern portion of the site. And another medium was the groundwater.

In all these different areas we go into like what we're going to do with respect to, let's say, in the building area we sampled where the concrete floors and walls were, what our action would be.

So I think the best way I could show you what we are going to do is through this slide and this transparency.

We found that the sediments in the river were pretty contaminated and based on guidance,

we were going to remove it to a level that's acceptable to living organisms who would inhabit that area.

The first measure we would put what's called a temporary sheet pile cofferdam -- this picture shows what it looks like -- in order to excavate the contaminant material from down in that mudflat area. Of course the river sometimes would overflow it and also in flood conditions some of the water would rise higher than what it normally would. So that would keep the water out temporally while we do the work in that area called the river sediment area.

MR. LABENZ (A Member of the Audience): How deep is the contamination?

MR. LEE: In the river sediment area? We estimate -- it's in the Proposed Plan. We saw it up to six feet in some cases.

This is another shot of that temporary cofferdam. So it is a common practice.

Also in that area based on the map I showed you, the PCB concentrations, I've Xed out the areas that we found levels that were high and how we're going to remove it. The levels are above our cleanup level of 25 parts per million. This is

actually a different depth profile of what's in the southern portion of this site. So at three feet these are the two high areas that we'll take out, excavate and dispose. At eight feet about these two areas here. At 16 feet it's that area.

So all together there's almost like three hot spots. And in addition to this, in the courtyard area we have surface soil which is marked hot. That will be taken out and disposed of.

Also, we have an underground storage tank we think is still there and it's still leaking because based on the oil samples that we've taken up from a nearby well that's located about in this area, we think that's what's causing the oil, is still this source here.

After we build this wall and take out the sediments and then dispose of these areas, part of our remedy will include a permanent sheet pile wall and oil water separator. I'll try to best explain that.

What that is, it surrounds the site and the water fluctuates up and down. Some of the water floats over here, but some of the water is as high as here. And based on what we sampled so far, most of the oil that we detected had PCBs, and being

that PCBs float on the top, we would tend to capture it through these portholes.

It's kind of hard to explain. You wonder how does it get to these sort of like sumps or manholes in here. Well, the way it's done is through the trenches that would cover the banks of the site. In fact, this is a sheet pile wall that's installed to hold back the site from slushing into the river. And behind there is the sump trench.

An example of the sheet pile wall is this. There's another close-up view of that, the sheet pile wall.

This picture is useful because it shows kind of like a pipe, which for this sheet pile wall drains the water and in which case these will run right along the sheet pile wall.

The concept of that is something like out in here where you have a pipe. Instead of having a pipe, you have something that goes the total depth and you can see from this picture all this water comes gushing out into sort of like a manhole that you've seen previously. And being that oil is lighter than water, it will float on the top and then from that our remedy will be to remove the oil from the top.

That's just another picture of that sheet pile wall from the area shot.

So basically, just to recap our proposed remedy, the building area and the site boundary, that's the whole site, we intend to put access restrictions on it and deed restrictions. Also, the access restriction will include something like a fence. If the fence is there already, we intend to maintain that fence for the duration of the life of the site.

For the courtyard area the surface soil we intend to excavate and dispose of off-site.

River sediment areas, which is the sediments, we intend to excavate and relocate as fill for the hot spots.

MR. LABENZ (Member of the Audience): You skipped deed restriction.

MR. LEE: Deed restriction. Basically that's for future land use, which we don't intend to see any homes being built there.

MR. LABENZ: I think that's a flaw in your study.

MR. LEE: You do?

MR. LABENZ: The only current use for any of these waterfront properties in the last, I

guess, 20 years is properties and facilities similar to Salem Harbor. There is no industry moving back into this area.

MR. LEE: Are you saying there might not be any home development?

MR. LABENZ: No, I'm saying there will be. It's the only thing left to put there, especially with many of the things that Green Space and the Pennsylvania Environmental Commission are trying to do, open up access ways along the waterfront there for the public. So they will be clamoring to get homes or residences and condominiums similar to those that are being developed along the Delaware now.

So your study really was flawed because you didn't consider residences.

MS. McELHONE: Why would they do that if the City didn't tell them?

MR. LABENZ: If you look at the development along the waterfront, that's the only thing going in.

DR. SMITH: The main purpose of a deed restriction here based on a human health point of view would be to prevent use of the groundwater. Other than that, at least, again, just from the human

health point of view, there would be no particular significant risk for recreational use of the property.

MR. LABENZ: For recreational use. I'm saying basically it will be residences in the future.

DR. SMITH: Even that, as long as they're not drinking water from wells, that's the crucial thing.

MR. LABENZ: My name is Jim Labenz, L A B E N Z, President of Tacony Civic Association.

MS. McELHONE: But that deed restriction will be on there that says you cannot build housing.

MR. LABENZ: No, he said you can't use well water.

MS. McELHONE: Or you can't use well water.

DR. SMITH: Right.

MR. LEE: Our scenario is based on that it's not being developed for homes. That's how we approached the risk assessments.

DR. SMITH: That's true. But I'm just telling you that the important part of the deed restriction -- I'm not sure exactly what form it will take. We're still in the Proposed Plan stage. But

from a toxicological point of view, it will be to prevent contact with groundwater.

MR. LABENZ: Even if you have the excavation?

DR. SMITH: Actually the extraction system should fix the problem with excavation. That was the contact with the oily layer. And that should be removed by that. It's only in a certain place anyway. So that in fact it should be safe for excavation after the EPA is finished with it.

MR. ANDERSON: Let me make a suggestion here that what we need to do, I think, is to go through all the different pieces of the remedy. And then we'll get back to the residential use. I think once you see what we're doing and the way the whole thing kind of fits together, it might be a little more obvious as to --

MR. LABENZ: I didn't mean to chime in. It's just that when a subject was skipped, I wanted to --

MR. ANDERSON: That's fine. My name is Patrick Anderson. I'm the Chief of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Superfund Remedial Section.

MR. LEE: We were up here at the river sediment areas. They would be excavated and

used as fill at the hot spots if they were below that cleanup level in the hot spots.

In the southern portion of the site, we broke it down into two areas, the underground storage tank and what we call the NAPL area, subsurface soil area. And for that we propose disposing of the underground storage tank and then the PCB hot spots. They would not be limited to just so-called the NAPL area, which is shown on your map, those spots that were marked in red X's.

And for the groundwater we broke it down into two different areas, the groundwater and the oil layer on that area. The groundwater we propose just to have no action on it, and for the oil layer we propose to use an oil water separator and dispose of the oil that comes out of there.

To recap it, the total remedy is estimated at $17,000,000.

I should mention a couple things. One, the DNAPL, which you'll read in the Proposed Plan, being that PCBs are heavier than water, they'll sink to a lower aquifer, so to speak, and we want to take a look at that to see if it's actually so. So those manholes you see will be designed so they could capture it in case that does exist and the PCBs do

sink.

Another is that the proposed remedy is based on removal of PCB levels, not the -- just oil, where there's oil just remove it. We're actually looking for the PCBs and capturing the PCBs as the source.

With that, I think that's it. If I could turn it back over to Ms. Barnett.

MS. BARNETT: Okay. We wanted to take additional questions now. I know there have already been some. But others, we'd like to hear from you.

Yes? Could you state your name, please.

MR. VALEN (A Member of the Audience): My name is Carl Valen, V A L E N, first part of Valentine.

I have a business across the street from this site. I want to know, when is this going to go into effect?

MS. BARNETT: When is the action going to start?

MR. VALEN: Yes.

MR. LEE: In about -- once we have the responsive parties who will sign up to do a

design, two to four years after the design you'll actually see everything done.

MR. VALEN: So we're looking at two to three years from, say, today? Is that what you're saying?

MR. LEE: No. No. It will take about maybe two years for everybody to agree to do the cleanup and the design -- start the design.

MR. VALEN: So you're looking at longer than two years? Is that what you're saying?

MR. LEE: It's within that range, yes, based on my experience.

MR. VALEN: Okay. That answers my question. Thank you.

MS. BARNETT: Other questions? Yes?

MR. LABENZ: Jim Labenz again.

Were only PCB contaminants investigated here since the area just north of there was used extensively for asbestos removal when they demolished ships or took ships apart there? It has to be in there and maybe in major parts of your ground fill that is sitting right there.

DR. SMITH: No. Actually the EPA sampled for, oh, I think over two hundred different

contaminants in all the environmental samples. As for asbestos in particular, I don't know if we sampled for it or not.

MR. LEE: No, we didn't sample for asbestos.

MR. LABENZ: Okay. It should have been because that whole area was used to dismantle the Liberty Ships after the Second World War, as well as the Korean Conflict, and things that took place up there. They were all torn apart. Many of your PCBs came from some of those ships just above Milnor there, Northern Metal.

MR. LEE: I don't know how great of an impact it will have on human health risk or --

MR. LABENZ: Not so much now, but if they get into the excavation phase, there will be re-exposure to the construction workers especially.

DR. SMITH: Well, speaking generally, the only kind of asbestos that presents a health risk is what's called friable asbestos, which means dry, flaky, blowing around.

MS. BARNETT: Can everybody hear Roy?

DR. SMITH: Typically soils which are being dug up are moist. So that it's not really

likely, even if there are masses of asbestos there, that it would be friable. And, well, I guess that's really the only, I guess, comfort I can offer in that. I'm not sure we were aware that it was an asbestos disposal area.

MR. LEE: No. I should mention we did look at the other chemicals. For example, lead, had a high amount of lead in it and you could see in your Proposed Plan, I think Figure Four, which we indicated what the levels are in the groundwater and in the soil, and even based on that, Roy has found that not to be a human health threat.

DR. SMITH: Yes. We had analyses for over two hundred substances.

MR. LABENZ: That's based on the study that you've done, which doesn't include residences, which is a major concern to me, because the only future usage that I see, that I'm sure many, many of the people in the community see, will be towards building residences in that area, especially on the waterfront. Because if you look at all the water development along the Delaware that's taking place now -- well, look at what they're doing to the prison. People live there. They may be prisoners, but they live there. And they're not using the

groundwater, I'm sure, but it's a major concern. That's right up the street from where this site is. A major prison. They just rebuilt it.

MS. BARNETT: Well, these kind of comments are the ones that are good to be getting at this meeting. As Dr. Smith said, some of these deed restrictions that we're talking about are not set in stone yet. So if you all see that this may be a future use, then that's a sign to us that we need to think carefully about what types of deed restrictions we need to put there. So we can say it's okay to put a house here, but you just can't use the water. Or is it not okay to even put residences there.

MR. LABENZ: Well, is it too late to go back and reassess your study there to include human occupancy? In other words, you would go back over your exposure assessment and instead of eliminating residences, as you did, include that.

DR. SMITH: Actually, it could be done fairly easily. Typically, I can at least give you a ball-park figure for that.

The residential risks of the site as it is, if we assess them, would be something like twice the industrial exposure risks, not for the construction workers, but just the on-site guys who

are working around but not digging.

MR. LABENZ: Would it require more extensive cleanup?

DR. SMITH: For the adult employee surface soil was about seven in ten thousand. So the risk to a resident would be about twice that or a little less than two in -- it would be close to one in ten thousand. Something like that. But that, again, that's before cleanup.

MR. LABENZ: But what I'm saying is it may require a more extensive cleanup than what you projected because of that.

DR. SMITH: Actually, I think the assessment that would be more interesting would be to calculate the health risk at the proposed cleanup level rather than the way it is now because there will be a cleanup done. So simply look at the proposed cleanup, calculate the risks after that is done. We can do that. Yes, that can be done.

MR. LABENZ: I think it definitely should be considered because this will impact our community's value for that area and really reflect, you know, heavily on the financial side of the area.

MR. ANDERSON: Understand, also, the risk scenario that Dr. Smith went through. He was

fifty feet along the Delaware River right straight down to Center City from Pennypack Park. We're also looking at above Pennypack Park to Glen Ford, which is an estate that's right on the river.

So we're talking about that little piece that you have sticking out--

MR. LABENZ: It would be a small recreational area --

MS. McELHONE: -- that's full of oils and crud and hot spot PCBs is exactly one of the areas that we want to go through.

MR. ANDERSON: Does it go past the prison?

MS. McELHONE: The prison is going to be moved back and we're going to get this whole section. It's already under proposal.

MR. LABENZ: Well, the prison won't go anywhere.

MS. McELHONE: Well, they're going to give us access to it.

MR. RUNDELL: What about the junk yard that's next to the site? On one side we have the really nice looking kid's home, but on the other side we have a junk yard.

MS. McELHONE: The junk yard is an

talking about a construction worker who actually would be digging down into that layer of oil that has the PCBs on it. It wasn't just even simply a construction worker rolling around in the surface soil as it exists today. You would have to physically get down into the material.

Now, also understand that deed restrictions are going to make it clear that there are PCBs at low concentrations that will remain on site. We'll have to sit and talk with the attorneys as to whether we can actually restrict the future land use.

MR. LABENZ: There's a proposed park and everything right there. It's just above that.

MR. LEE: You mean right next to I-95?

MR. LABENZ: There's 95 and the entrance to Pennypack and down along the Delaware possibly. We're looking at getting a 50-foot right-of-way.

MR. ANDERSON: That's at least a quarter to half mile away.

MR. LABENZ: No, I don't think so.

MS. McELHONE: No, Pennypack Park is, but the right-of-way that we're looking for is

illegal dump which contains biologics, red bag hospital waste, as well as newspapers and stuff. That's also supposed to be cleared out of there also some day.

MR. LABENZ: There's a Senatorial investigation into that.

MR. RUNDELL: Okay. I was just curious what you had in mind in that area.

MS. McELHONE: That's a whole other one.

MR. GRELLER (A Member of the Audience): We're right next door to that. Morris Iron and Steel. We have nothing to do with Northern Metals where the paper is. We're spending this year alone two hundred fifty thousand dollars for concrete. The board of directors of our company asked me to come here tonight because we're concerned about the property next door and we have expansion plans. We're thinking about leaving the Philadelphia area. Now we have 60 employees. We're concerned about the hazards.

Ron Greller, G R E L L E R, Morris Iron and Steel.

During the cleanup what kind of hazards will our employees have?

MR. RUNDELL: It's really a risk scenario. For your employees to be at risk they have to be exposed, and unless they're actually digging up in the --

MR. GRELLER: Which we won't be.

MR. RUNDELL: Right. The people who will be at risk will be the people actually doing the remediation.

The only other risk I can think of is some dust, which is minimal.

MR. LEE: We will consider that in our remedy because the orphanage is next door, also.

MR. GRELLER: We were concerned about during the cleanup to our employees.

MR. LEE: We found that with precautions like wetting down the soil and so forth, we can remove the soil without any dust getting into the air when transporting the PCBs.

MR. ANDERSON: Let's get back to the residential use part. With the materials that are dug out and the new soils put down and then another cover material put back on top of it, and we're exploring the possibility of putting, for lack of something better, kind of a geotextile material marker underneath so even if all else failed, all the notices

in the deed, the signs on the fence and everything else that should be there for a contractor or somebody else that they should see it, that as they began to dig, they would hit this material and see that it's a warning to them that there are PCB soils that may be beneath that.

With all of that and the fact of the integrity of this cover, we also have an oil water separator that will be active for some amount of time. We don't know how long. It depends on the yield. If we can get all the oil off and there's no more to get, then the system will be shut down.

But while all of that is going on, you wouldn't use it for a residential type of setting.

MR. LABENZ: I'm talking sometime in the future.

MR. ANDERSON: You're talking far, far in the future. You know, I guess there are probably some engineering things that could be done to completely encapsulate all of that and make it viable to do it for residential use if there was a need. But it would be fairly expensive. You really have to want to develop that relatively small portion. The fact that it's fill by itself, I don't know what kind of structure you could have on it.

MS. McELHONE: You couldn't just clear out all the fill and let the river go back to the way it was?

MR. ANDERSON: Unfortunately just the depth and the volume of soil, it's really prohibitive to do something like that. It really, really is.

Plus you see here kind of one slice of the whole riverfront. You do that and right adjacent to it you've got a similar type situation.

MS. BARNETT: Any other questions?

MS. ANDERSON (A Member of the Audience): Judy Anderson.

This may have been addressed. I walked in late. I know kids go down in that area and they fish. Is there any kinds of postings right now?

MS. BARNETT: On the site itself you're talking about?

MR. LEE: There is a fish ban on the Delaware River but --

MS. ANDERSON: They're kids.

MR. LABENZ: There are no signs that restrict fishing in any way. In fact, it's really great fishing down there and if you go a little further south it's even a little bit better. Many of

the fish that are in the Delaware, because of the PCB contamination there throughout the Delaware, you cannot eat them.

MS. ANDERSON: Right. I think most people in the area are aware of that. I'm talking about the kids being there walking in that material.

MR. ANDERSON: It's fenced in certain portions, but I guess there is access down into the mudflat area.

MR. LEE: Right. Around the site area, I'm sure we could put that in our record of decisions to post signs not to fish around there.

DR. SMITH: There's a couple other points with that, too. This site is not the only source of PCBs in the Delaware River. It's one of quite a few. We think it's a significant source, but it's certainly not the only source. And while we think it's highly desirable to stop the PCBs leaching from this site, the fish in the river are not going to become edible any time soon. So the advisories are going to have to stay in effect. It's just that the source needs to be stopped.

MS. BARNETT: Any other questions?

MR. PRYOR (A Member of the Audience): Cesar, did you take Kelly's place?

MS. BARNETT: Could we have your name, please.

MR. PRYOR: Jerry Pryor from Tacony Civic.

Did you take Jack Kelly's place?

MR. LEE: Yes.

MR. PRYOR: How long has the EPA known about this condition on this site?

MR. LEE: From the time line I think I showed you --

MR. LABENZ: 1977 --

MR. PRYOR: Jim, I asked him. How long? Pat, do you know?

MR. ANDERSON: I guess from the original oil slicks that were -- the oil was seen on the water, that goes back to the late seventies. So it's been 15, 18 years.

MR. PRYOR: How long have you been on your job now?

MR. LEE: 1993.

MR. PRYOR: When I was dealing with Jack Kelly, we visited the site and the awareness of that tank that was there, there were contents of oil in the tank, PCBs. Was it ever removed?

MR. LEE: When was that?

MR. PRYOR: Before you took the job.

MR. ANDERSON: The tank is coming out. That's part of the remedy as you saw.

MR. PRYOR: I didn't ask about that, Pat. I knew the tank was coming out. We are now two and a half to three years down the line and the tank is still in the ground. The question I have is was the oil removed at the time when they were aware of it in 1991, 1992?

MR. LEE: When we were on site about 1993, 1994 to try to investigate what's in the tank, they came across a solid slab of concrete and couldn't get beyond that solid slab of concrete except to smash it up and pull it out. So that was just for investigation so we didn't go any further.

MR. PRYOR: So there was no removal of anything?

MR. LEE: No. That was the reason.

MR. LABENZ: You just allowed it to continue to contaminate?

MR. ANDERSON: There were reports that the tank was drained and filled with inert materials, such as sand. That's what the reports show. We don't have enough evidence to verify that so

we're pulling the tank. The fact that we didn't do it two and a half years ago, you're right, if there are still oils there that's allowing the material to release, that's been going on for that time, yes.

MR. PRYOR: And it will go on for two and a half to four years. Is it going to be out of there soon?

MR. ANDERSON: Yes, as soon as we can get this record of decision made, we're going to get it the hell out of there.

MR. PRYOR: You were talking about possibly five to six years will transpire before we even get a lick of --

MR. ANDERSON: You're right. It will be one of the -- not necessarily the first but probably the -- it will be one of the first items that will be pulled out.

MR. PRYOR: There was a discussion at the time I had something to do with it about going after the power companies from Maine to North Carolina to pay part of this expense and cost. Was that ever done?

MR. LEE: I think that's part of the group of responsive parties that signed on with the EPA to do the study and some of them are here in

this room today.

MR. PRYOR: But did they nail them down or did they just agree to --

MR. ANDERSON: The way this works is you have two opportunities to be involved in the process if you are a potentially responsible party. First, you can do the remedial investigation and feasibility studies. There's a group of potentially responsible parties that have done the RI/FS.

At the ROD stage there's also the opportunity to do the work and do the cleanup and pay for all of that, have their contractors or whoever do that.

We sincerely believe and hope that that's what we're going to do, that the agency's position is that it's a situation where if there are responsible parties, potentially responsible parties, then those individuals will fund the process and we enter into a legally binding document that's entered with the Court to have them continue until the process is completed.

MR. PRYOR: Yeah, but Pat, that's what we talked about that they were going to do two, three years ago -- it's four years ago. They had instituted legal proceeding and were supposed to take

them to Court to force them to go along with it.

MR. ANDERSON: What I'm saying is the work has been done to this point by them and we hope they'll continue to do it. If in fact they decide not to, we have different ways of going. We can do it ourselves by using the Superfund Trust that has money in it, as of the moment anyway. Or we can order them. We have our own powers to issue a unilateral order telling them they have to do the work.

MR. PRYOR: Well, though, you see my concern. The problem is that if we're now at a point where we all agree that we're going to do A, B, C, and we don't have them nailed down, now we've got another legal process of five years with corporate lawyers and government lawyers and more expense and everything else, and the site is still sitting there unattended.

MR. ANDERSON: Well, it's not unattended.

MR. PRYOR: But it's still leaching and causing the problem.

MR. RUNDELL: That's the flip side of the coin. One side of the coin says we get the people who are responsible to clean it up. The

unfortunate part that comes along with that is all the legal negotiations that draw the process out. So it's -- unfortunately you can't have both. You can't have speed and have the responsible parties pay for it. It doesn't really happen that way.

MR. PRYOR: But wasn't that part of the agreement initially? In other words, when they talked about it, and I sat in a couple meetings, they had already started. Jack Kelly and his staff had already started to institute proceedings to force those power companies to come to the table and put up a fund of some kind. That's when we left it. They were going to let us know what was going to happen as soon as they did that, and never heard another word. This is the first time I ever heard anything since that happened.

MS. McELHONE: Well, this is the result of those first meetings.

MR. PRYOR: You don't know what you're talking about. I'm telling you we already sat and had agreements.

MR. RUNDELL: The agreement was to do the work. And then you have to decide what the work is. And it's unfortunately a very long and tedious and frustrating process.

MR. ANDERSON: The way the process breaks down, you know, it's not just a soup to nuts kind of agreement that you do. You do the first agreement to do the remedial investigation feasibility study, which is what is completed at this point in time.

And then the second half -- and it doesn't have to take a real long time. You know, if there's agreement and the attorneys can kind of work out the different language, then it can happen relatively quickly. Now, that means months, a couple of months, not necessarily years. If it goes on more than a couple of months, then we switch to one of our other mechanisms, typically a unilateral order ordering the responsible parties to do the work.

MR. LABENZ: Then the lawyers start.

MR. ANDERSON: So I mean we're close here. When Cesar said two to four years, I don't know if you heard him say that was from beginning to end of the project, is what he was talking about, not to just get it commenced or begun.

MR. LABENZ: Well, as Jerry indicated, and as I'm sure Ginny here, we're quite concerned about that tank. If it's still leaching,

it's still contaminating, that should be your first priority to at least drain it, investigate it further and drain it and prevent that. And the next thing is to pull it out of there once you build your water wall, so to speak.

MR. ANDERSON: Yes, sequentially it will be one of the first things that's going to come off there.

MR. PRYOR: Couldn't that have been done before, Pat? Couldn't that have been done three, four years ago when they were aware what the hell the condition was and go and initially take the primary source of what the problem was and then deal with the rest of it later?

MR. ANDERSON: It was generally believed, again, that it had been emptied, that it had been cleaned and that it had been filled. It was only when we tried to confirm that and show absolutely that that was the case, and we couldn't get to it without drilling some way in on a weird angle or something like that, that we decided that it had to come out because we couldn't confirm that there wasn't already, you know, oils that were being stored there.

MR. LABENZ: But since it's been four years since that initial point, wouldn't that be

enough, I guess, justification to say, all right, let's go in there, get that tank out of there right now, and then go back and hit them with the bill later on since it is a potential?

MR. ANDERSON: We only do that when there's what we call immediate removal or immediate threat. The only threat here is actually to the river and to some of the aquatic life.

MR. LEE: Or long term effect. It's not -- I mean it's not affecting -- people aren't drinking the water underneath the site.

MR. LABENZ: Well, see, that's part of our major concern, too, because they are. Your suction for your water works for Northeast Philadelphia comes from less than a quarter of a mile away from that site.

MR. LEE: We understand that.

MR. LABENZ: You know, your water that this city drinks is taken from there, less than a quarter of a mile. It's cumulative.

MR. ANDERSON: We're very aware of that.

MR. LABENZ: I'm curious to see how many residents have been tested that don't have access to bottled water to see if they're accumulating more

and more PCBs.

MR. RUNDELL: The city water is tested all the time.

MS. McELHONE: I know they had a mysterious bacteria and they couldn't figure it out. Instead of solving it, they waited for it to go away.

MR. RUNDELL: Getting back to the tank, it would be nice if we could go out and just pull it out, but one of the problems that we have to face when we start sequencing our remediation is that there's a lot of soil that's above the water table that has PCB oils absorbed to it. It's just not one little thin layer. There's a whole smear of oily soil where the oil is trapped against the soil particles in the pore spaces. So when we start digging up that soil and removing the tank, that soil becomes loose and the oil that's trapped now can flow out. So when we pull up the tank and create this big hole, we're also going to have a good size pool of oil sitting there. So we have to be careful and not have a release of oil just from our action.

So one of the first things we're going to have to do is get the oil water separator in there in place so when we do remove the soils and tank, whatever release of oil occurs, is captured

either by skimmers in the hole or through the skimmers in the oil water separator.

MS. McELHONE: I just have one question. I noticed in your graph the Wissahickon shift, the Trentonian gravel, and the next layer of silts and soils, are you telling me that's a sealant between the contaminated river bed and the Trentonian gravel which is the groundwater? I'm just asking.

MR. RUNDELL: It's what's called an aquitard. It's a barrier.

MS. McELHONE: Would it help if I said I have geology training?

MR. RUNDELL: Yes, it is. The groundwater --

MS. McELHONE: And you've tested it and it's in place and there's no --

MR. RUNDELL: Our wells drill down -- we don't drill through it because we don't want to create a hole and pathway, but we drilled down to that depth, not in all the wells but in a number of the wells.

MS. McELHONE: Okay.

MR. RUNDELL: -- to that depth. And you can see it in the mudflats where that layer is. At the edge of the mudflats is where it inches

out.

MS. McELHONE: And you're going to clear out the mudflats, put in the cofferdam, then you're going to pull the tank out?

MR. RUNDELL: Right.

MS. McELHONE: And put in the oil separator or put in the oil separator and then pull the tank, and the oil separator will also contain the PCB screen so that the water flowing through it will be washed clear?

MR. RUNDELL: The water and the oils that flow into the oil water separator, the oil and the PCB are together. So as the oil and water flow into that separator, the oil layer thickens because it's sort of backed up, and it all flows towards those sump pumps where the groundwater can exit out the bottom and the oil sort of accumulates and we skim it off the top.

MR. ANDERSON: The vehicle for the PCBs to get out of wherever they are --

MS. McELHONE: Is the oil.

MR. ANDERSON: -- is the oil. It's called hydrophobic.

MS. McELHONE: I know.

MR. ANDERSON: They rather stay

with the soil, but mostly they like to stay with the oil.

MS. McELHONE: So you're going to literally wash the soil clean.

MR. RUNDELL: We're going to allow, in a sense, mother nature to wash it clean. We're going to get the rinsed water.

MS. McELHONE: Okay. Sounds good.

MS. BARNETT: Other questions? Anybody else?

Okay. Thank you for coming. We'll stand up here for a few minutes as long as we can stand the heat.

MR. LABENZ: One other question, I guess. Is it possible to get copies of your slides that you put up there, as well as a copy of the minutes that the stenographer has taken?

MS. BARNETT: Yes. The minutes of this will be placed in the library or the place that has -- the location --

MS. McELHONE: Send it to either the Tacony Library or the Holmesburg branch. I assure you that they are well aware of the residents' interest --

MS. BARNETT: Okay.

MS. McELHONE: -- and will make sure they know where it is.

MS. BARNETT: Okay. I will do that then. Sorry for the confusion. Thank you.

MS. McELHONE: That's all right.

MR. ANDERSON: We find some of the bigger libraries, what has happened in the past, if they get a box, they just don't open it right away. They don't realize something has got to be done with it.

MS. McELHONE: Well, the difference is they have lots of people so they don't worry about it because it's somebody else's job. The small libraries there's only them.

MR. ANDERSON: That's a good suggestion.

MS. BARNETT: Well, thank you for coming out on such a hot evening. I apologize that there was no air conditioning. We'll be here if anybody has one-on-one questions.

- - -

(Whereupon, the hearing was concluded at 9:13 p.m.)

- - -

CERTIFICATION

I, Diane C. DiMidio, hereby certify that the proceedings in the aforegoing matter taken on July 27, 1995, are contained fully and accurately in the stenographic notes taken by me, and that Pages 1 to 64, inclusive, of this testimony are a true and correct transcript of the same.

Diane C. DiMidio
Registered Merit Reporter

- - -

The foregoing certification of this transcript does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under the direct control and/or direction of the certifying shorthand reporter.

- - -